

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 14, 17, 21, 28 and 29 have been amended and claim 9 has been canceled. Claims 1-8 and 10-32 remain in the application.

The Examiner stated that claims 5, 10 and 14-27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all base and intervening limitations. Accordingly,

a) claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form and claims 6 and 7 have been amended to depend from claim 5 with claim 8 remaining dependent from claim 7;

b) claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form and claims 11 and 12 have been amended to depend from claim 5 with claim 8 remaining dependent from claim 7 (claim 9 has been canceled); and

c) claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form with claims 15-17 and 25-27 remaining dependent from claim 14 – also, claims 28 and 29 have been amended to depend from claim 14 (claims 18-23 remain dependent from claim 17, claim 24 remains dependent from claim 23 and claims 30-32 remain dependent from claim 29).

In addition, minor typographical errors have been corrected in claims 17 and 21.


Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a display structure that comprises:
first and second conductors;
a plurality of light-emitting elements coupled between said conductors; and
at least one spacer positioned to space said first and second conductors apart
wherein said spacer defines a light redirector positioned to redirect light
from a respective light-emitting element.

Because the cited art (cited by the Examiner and by the Applicant) fails to teach the spacer recited in amended claim 1, this independent claim patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Because claims 2-4 add additional limitations to claim 1, these claims also patentably distinguish over the cited art. The structures of claims 1-4 are supported by the filed specification and drawings (e.g., see FIGS. 1A, 1B, 1C, 2, and 6A-6C).

Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections and an early allowance of claims 1-8 and 10-32.

It is noted that the Office Action carries a mailing date of August 9, 2005. It is further noted that the Examiner had a conversation with Richard Koppel (of the office listed below) concerning the fact that the Office Action had not been received as of September 1. The Examiner stated that he was sending another copy of the Office Action and the deadline for response might be restarted from the later mailing date. Subsequently, it was determined that the mailed Office Action had been mislaid and, accordingly, this Amendment will be filed within 3 months of the original mailing date of August 9, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,
William R. Ratcliffe
By 
Joseph Compton
Registration No. 34,308

KOPPEL, JACOBS, PATRICK & HEYBL
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite 107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
(818) 788-6983